Application No.: 10/771,584 Amendment dated October 8, 2007

Response to Office action dated June 19, 2007

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicants acknowledge, with thanks, the receipt of the office action dated June 19, 2007. Claims 1-3, 4-10, and 12-14 are currently pending.

Claims 15-28 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 15-28 were cancelled and therefore, this rejection is moot.

Claims 1-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. \(\frac{\}{2}\)102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,127,524 to Renda et al. For the amendments and arguments set forth below, all pending claims are patentably distinct over the art of record.

The subject application is directed to a system and method for role-based control of a document processing device. An electronic document and a document processing instruction for a document processing operation to be performed on the electronic document is received via an associated network. User data of an identity of a user of a document processing device is acquired via the associated network, wherein the user data is associated with the received electronic document. The user provides login data, after prompting thereof, via an interface associated with the document processing device. Device access data of device access privileges associated with each of a plurality of users, user data and login data is compared with the device access data, and the login data is associated with at least one preselected user role. A permission matrix template specifying allowable usage options of the data processing device associated with each of a plurality of user roles is retrieved and permission matrix data is generated as in accordance with the at least one preselected user role and retrieved permission matrix template, the permission matrix data including data representative of allowable usage options of the document processing device from a plurality thereof by a user associated with the user data. The permission matrix data is then communicated to the document processing device to allow for control thereof.

Renda is directed to a system wherein user permissions are assigned to correspond to a MAC address. Renda notes that "In one embodiment, a system administrator can define the privileges of a class of users and assign a user to the class." See col. 9, lines 33-34. This association allows for class-based access to a network by interception of communications to and from other network devices. This functionality is directed to give access to a set group of

Application No.: 10/771,584

Amendment dated October 8, 2007

Response to Office action dated June 19, 2007

network devices. Renda neither teaches, nor contemplates, a mechanism by which various functions available to a particular device may be set and managed. The subject application teaches a system and method by which an administrator enabled to determine with functions of a particular device may be regulated. Insofar as Renda accomplishes its device access control on the basis of a MAC address, once routing to a device is enabled, no constraint as to access to various functions on that device is taught.

In view of the forgoing, amendment to each of remaining independent claims 1 and 8 has been made to render more clearly the distinctions over Renda. By virtue of such amendment, each claim now includes limitations wherein login information (as contrasted with a MAC address) is associated with availability of various functions within one or more devices. Unlike Renda, such available functions are set to be effective irrespective as to what particular machine is being used to request such access. With the teachings of Renda, a user need only go to a device with a different MAC address, and available network devices may be changed.

In view of the forgoing amendments and comments, it is submitted that all claims are patentably distinct over the art of record and in condition for allowance thereover. An early allowance of all claims is respectfully requested.

If there are any fees necessitated by the foregoing communication, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0902, referencing our Docket No. 66329/00141.

Date: 10/8/07

Respectfully submitted,

Susan L. Mizer

Registration No. 38,245 TUCKER ELLIS & WEST LLP 1150 Huntington Bldg.

925 Euclid Ave.

Cleveland, Ohio 44115-1414 Customer No.: 23380

Tel.: (216) 696-3466 Fax: (216) 592-5009